

Appl. No.: 10/564,205
Reply to Office Action of: 03/11/2009

REMARKS

Claims 52, 54 and 55 have been cancelled without prejudice and their features have been added to claim 49. In view of paragraph 9 of the office action, claim 49 should be in condition for allowance.

Though the claims dependent upon claim 49 contain their own allowable subject matter, these claims should at least be allowable due to their dependence from allowable claim 49. However, to expedite prosecution at this time, no further comment will be made.

Claim 57 has been converted from dependent form into independent form. This change in form does not narrow or limit the scope of the claim. The independent claim which claim 57 was formerly dependent upon has not been cancelled. Therefore, the full scope of the doctrine of equivalents should apply to claim 57 as if it was originally presented in independent form when the application was filed. In view of paragraph 9 of the office action, claim 57 should be in condition for allowance.

Though the claim dependent upon claim 57 contains its own allowable subject matter, the claim should at least be allowable due to its dependence from allowable claim 57. However, to expedite prosecution at this time, no further comment will be made.

Claim 60 has been converted from dependent form into independent form. This change in form does not narrow or limit the scope of the claim. The independent claim which

Appl. No.: 10/564,205
Reply to Office Action of: 03/11/2009

claim 60 was formerly dependent upon has not been cancelled. Therefore, the full scope of the doctrine of equivalents should apply to claim 60 as if it was originally presented in independent form when the application was filed. In view of paragraph 9 of the office action, claim 60 should be in condition for allowance.

Though the claims dependent upon claim 60 contain their own allowable subject matter, these claims should at least be allowable due to their dependence from allowable claim 60. However, to expedite prosecution at this time, no further comment will be made.

Claims 78 and 79 have been cancelled without prejudice above and their features have been added to claim 69. In view of paragraph 9 of the office action, claim 69 should be in condition for allowance.

Though the claims dependent upon claim 69 contain their own allowable subject matter, these claims should at least be allowable due to their dependence from allowable claim 69. However, to expedite prosecution at this time, no further comment will be made.

Other small amendments have been made to the claims to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph and to clarify the claims.

Favorable consideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issue remain, the examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Appl. No.: 10/564,205
Reply to Office Action of: 03/11/2009

Respectfully submitted,

Mark F. Harrington 5/20/09
Mark F. Harrington (Reg. No. 31,686) Date
Customer No.: 29683
Harrington & Smith, PC
4 Research Drive
Shelton, CT 06484-6212
203-925-9400

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

5/20/2009
Date

Elaine F. Mian
Name of Person Making Deposit